

Response
U.S.S.N. 10/772,140
Attorney Docket No.: PQM-002
Page 6 of 8

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claim 20 has been cancelled. Claims 2, 10, 13, and 17-19 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Regarding Withdrawn and Cancelled Claims

Claims 2, 10, 13, and 17-19 have been withdrawn from consideration. Applicant respectfully requests that Claims 2, 10, and 13 be rejoined upon allowance of the application because Claims 2, 10, and 13 depend from allowable Claims 1 and 9. (See M.P.E.P. § 821.04). Further, Applicant respectfully requests that Claims 17-19 be rejoined upon allowance of the application because Claims 17-19 require all the limitations of allowable product Claims 1 and 9. (See M.P.E.P. § 821.04(b)).

Claim 20 has been herein cancelled. Applicant does not acquiesce to the rejection of Claim 20 and reserves the right to file a continuing application or take such other appropriate action as deemed necessary to protect the subject matter of the canceled claims. Applicant does not hereby abandon or waive any rights in the subject matter of the canceled claims.

Regarding Section 103 rejections

Claims 1, 3-9, 11, 12 and 14-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrett (U.S. Patent No. 5,737,203) in view of Kober (U.S. Patent No. 3,212,039). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The present invention provides a control winding element including a control conductor wound in a figure-eight configuration having a first winding and a second winding around respective outer legs. The winding configuration cancels induced voltages in the first and second windings, wherein a current through the control winding element causes a change in inductance of the main winding element. The advantage of the figure-eight design over prior art configurations is in the turn-by-turn cancellation of the induced voltage in the control coil allowing the variable inductor to operate in a higher magnetic flux region than prior art designs. In contrast, prior art designs cancel the induced voltage over the entire length of the coil, but allow the buildup of voltage between ground and each turn of the control coil thereby preventing

Response
U.S.S.N. 10/772,140
Attorney Docket No.: PQM-002
Page 7 of 8

the inductor to operate in a higher magnetic flux region. (See Specification, page 3, lines 17-27 and page 7, lines 1-13).

Barrett does not teach or suggest a control conductor wound in a figure-eight configuration. Rather, Barrett describes a transformer 40 including an E-shaped core 42 having a center leg 48 positioned between a first leg 44 and a second leg 46. The center leg 48 includes a primary winding 50 and a secondary winding 52. The first leg 44 includes a first DC control winding 54 and the second leg 46 includes a second but oppositely wound DC control winding 56. The DC control coils 54, 56 are joined in series to cancel out, as a whole, the induced voltage in the combined DC control coil 54, 56. Barrett's design allows for the buildup of voltage between ground and each turn of the DC control coil. Thus, the transformer of Barrett would breakdown if operated in high magnetic flux regions due to the turn-by-turn induced voltage in each winding of the DC control coil. (See Barrett, Col. 8, line 50 – 9, line 67; and Figs. 3A and 3B).

Kober does not teach or suggest a control conductor wound in a figure-eight configuration. Rather, Kober describes a variable voltage transformer (e.g. Fig 3); including an E-shaped core 1 having a center primary leg 2 and two outer secondary legs 3, 4. The primary leg 2 includes a primary winding 12 having three potential wrapping configurations (one figure-eight configuration) to allow for uniform flux density in the primary leg 2 and not for canceling of turn-by-turn induced voltages in the primary leg 2. Each of the secondary legs 3, 4 include a separate but oppositely wound secondary winding 15, 16. Similar to Barrett and other prior art designs, the secondary windings 15, 16 are joined in series to cancel out, as a whole, the induced voltage in the combined secondary winding 15, 16. Kober's design allows for the buildup of voltage between ground and each turn of the secondary winding 15, 16. Thus, the variable voltage transformer of Kober would breakdown if operated in high magnetic flux regions due to the turn-by-turn induced voltage in each winding of the secondary winding. (See Kober, Col. 2, line 58- Col. 5, line 40; and Figs. 3-6).

Neither Barrett or Kober, alone or in combination teach, suggests, or makes obvious "a control winding element comprising a control conductor wound in a figure-eight configuration having a first winding and a second winding around respective outer legs, the winding configuration canceling induced voltages in the first and second windings, wherein a current

Response
U.S.S.N. 10/772,140
Attorney Docket No.: PQM-002
Page 8 of 8

through the control winding element causes a change in inductance of the main winding element" as claimed in Claim 1 because neither Barrett or Kober look to solve the problem of canceling the turn-by-turn control coil induced voltage for operation in high magnetic flux density ranges. As such, one would not look to combine Barrett and Kober because the control coils of each reference exhibit a buildup of voltage between ground and each turn of the control coil. Thus, a variable inductor produced by the combination of Barrett and Kober would experience an electrical breakdown of the insulation in the control windings when operating in high magnetic flux regions. Claim 9 includes similar limitations. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claims 3-8, and 11, 12, 14-16 are dependent on allowable base claims 1 and 9, respectively, and are allowable for the same reasons. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 3-8, and 11, 12, 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.


CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 27, 2006

Telephone: (617) 526-9600
Facsimile: (617) 526-9899

By 
Joseph M. Maraia
Registration No. 55,926
Proskauer Rose LLP
One International Place, 22nd Floor
Boston, MA 02110

7675/58534-004 Current/8615978v1